

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

- A) Claims 1—80 were originally filed.
- B) Claim 11 was previously canceled.
- C) Claims 39—49, 52—63, 65—67 and 70—80 were previously withdrawn.
- D) Claims 1, 5, 8, 23, 32, 64 were previously presented.
- E) Claims 3, 6—7, 9—10, 12—13, 15, 18—22, 24—31, 33—38, 50—51 and 68—69 remain in their original form.
- F) Claims 2, 4, 8, 14 and 17 were amended.
- G) No claims were newly added.
- H) Claims 9, 16 are currently cancelled.
- I) Accordingly, claims 1—10, 12—38, 50—51, 64 and 68—69 are currently pending.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application.

35 U.S.C. §102, the Halberg reference

Claims 68 and 69 were rejected under §102 as being anticipated by the Halberg “Using Microsoft Excel 97” reference (hereinafter “Halberg”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 68 and 69.

Claim 68 recites:

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

1 “a first spreadsheet table supporting spreadsheet functionality and having
2 multiple cells; and

3 a second spreadsheet table *nested* within a cell of the first table.”

4 In contrast, the Halberg teaches *referencing formulas* from other
5 worksheets and workbooks. In particular, Halberg teaches a formula in one
6 spreadsheet can *reference* a cell or a range of cells in another spreadsheet. Thus,
7 calculation of a value for the formula can use as part of the input the values of
8 cells in other spreadsheets.

9
10 The Patent Office suggests that a first spreadsheet that includes a first cell
11 having a first formula configured to reference cell(s) from a second spreadsheet
12 discloses nesting a second spreadsheet table within a cell of a first spreadsheet
13 table. Essentially, the Patent Office suggests that *referencing cells* within a
14 formula in a first cell is the same as *nesting cells* within the first cell.

15 The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and maintains that there is a
16 fundamental difference between: (1) nesting a second spreadsheet within a cell of
17 a first spreadsheet (as recited in the claim); and (2) referencing cell(s) within a
18 second spreadsheet in a formula within a cell in a first spreadsheet (as disclosed by
19 Halberg). In fact, the Applicant maintains that “nesting” cells within a cell and
20 “referencing” cells using a formula contained within a cell are different procedures
21 that are used for different purposes. In particular, nesting and referencing are
22 different functions that are supported by different software structures, and may be
23 utilized for different reasons and for different results.
24
25

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

1 "Nesting" and "referencing" each have advantages and disadvantages, and
2 one or the other may be more desirable, depending on what the spreadsheet user is
3 trying to accomplish. Nesting may be used to increase the "resolution" within one
4 cell of a spreadsheet, by "nesting" another spreadsheet within that cell. For
5 example, in Fig. 5 of the Applicant's disclosure, a document 500 includes an outer
6 table 502 having an inner table 504 nested within the cell B3 of the outer table.
7 Note that the inner table is visible within the cell B3, and tends to "increase the
8 resolution" of the outer table in that one cell.

9
10 In contrast to the recited elements of the claim, the referencing taught by
11 Halberg does not allow a cell in a first spreadsheet to contain a second
12 spreadsheet. Instead, Halberg teaches that the second spreadsheet can contribute
13 values to a formula within the cell of the first spreadsheet, which are then
14 evaluated and the results are placed in the cell. This does not provide greater
15 resolution in the cell (such as seen in Fig. 5 of the Applicant's disclosure) and is
16 not visible upon printing.

17
18 Therefore, "nesting" and "referencing" are quite different concepts. The
19 Halberg reference, which discloses referencing, does not disclose nesting.
20 Accordingly, claim 68 is allowable, and the Applicant respectfully requests that
21 the rejection be removed.

22 Claim 69 depends from claim 68. Accordingly, claim 69 is allowable by
23 virtue this dependence. Additionally, claim 69 is allowable for reasons associated
24 with the elements recited in claim 69.
25

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

35 U.S.C. §103, Koppolu '701 in View of the Halberg Reference

Claims 1—10, 12—38, 50—51 and 64 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable due to Koppolu in view of Halberg.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

“presenting a free floating field configured for insertion into the document.”

In contrast, the Halberg reference does not disclose, “presenting a free floating field configured for insertion into the document.” Instead, Halberg provides a way to add comments to cells of a spreadsheet. Such comments provide a way to identify data or explain spreadsheet cell contents. Significantly, any comments added “do not affect the data nor do they appear when you print them,” (emphasis added, see page 99 of Halberg, bottom paragraph). Thus, the comment fields are distinguished from free floating fields, which do appear when the document is printed.

The Patent Office suggests that comment fields anticipate free floating fields. The Patent Office notes that anytime a pointer is passed over a cell a comments box pops up, allowing the user to choose insert and to thereby edit comments.

However, the Patent Office fails to take into consideration the difference between free floating fields and a pop-up comments box. A free floating field is a single cell table (see Applicant’s page 13, line 11) which is visible without passing

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

1 the cursor over it, and which does appear on the printed document. The free
2 floating field is capable of calculating formulas and containing data accessible by
3 other cells. Therefore, a free floating field is a single cell table, which has data
4 processing capabilities similar to a spreadsheet table. In contrast, the pop-up
5 comment boxes of Halberg are not suited for formulas, data calculation, access by
6 other spreadsheets, or other spreadsheet functions. Thus, the Halberg pop-up
7 comments boxes are stand-alone boxes (not accessible by spreadsheet cells) which
8 do not print.

9
10 Therefore, Halberg does not disclose the elements recited in claim 1, and
11 the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 1 be removed.

12 Claim 1 additionally recites, in part:

13 “enabling a user to reference a cell in the word processing table when
14 entering a formula into the free floating field.”

15 That is, a formula entered into the free floating field references the table.
16 Nothing in Halberg discloses or suggests that anything entered into the pop-up
17 comments box will be able to reference a cell in a table.

18
19 The Patent Office does not appear to have addressed the issue of what part
20 of Halberg shows the above-cited passage in claim 1. If the Patent Office persists
21 in this rejection, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office more
22 particularly identify where Halberg addresses the elements of the above-cited
23 passage in claim 1. Clearly, the pop-up comments box, cited by the Patent Office
24
25

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

as being analogous to the free floating field, is not configured to contain a formula or to reference a cell in a table.

Referring again to the Halberg reference, a pop-up comments box that allows a comment to be entered, but not printed, is disclosed. Moreover, the comment box does not allow a user to reference, from anything typed into the comments box, a cell in the word processing table. In contrast, claim 1 recites that a formula entered into the free floating field is capable of referencing a cell in the table. Such a reference is not disclosed by, envisioned by, or intended by, Halberg and his pop up comment boxes.

The Applicant therefore concludes that the pop-up comment boxes of Halberg do not teach the concepts of free floating fields, which are single cell tables that actually print as part of the document. Additionally, the comment pop-ups of Halberg do not allow a user to reference a cell in a word processing table when entering a formula. In fact, formulas cannot be entered into the comment pop-ups in a functional manner. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the section 103 rejection be removed.

Claim 2, as amended, recites, in part:

“presenting a word processing table and a free floating field within a document.”

As amended, claim 2 recites presentation of a free floating field. Such fields are not analogous to the pop-up comment boxes of Halberg. Therefore,

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

1 claim 2 is allowable for substantially the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable,
2 and those arguments are cited herein by reference.

3 Claim 3 depends from claim 1, and is allowable by virtue of this
4 dependency, as well as for reasons associated with the elements recited.

5 Claim 4 has been amended, and is allowable for at least the reasons claim 2
6 is allowable, as well as for other reasons associated with elements recited by claim
7 4.

8 Claim 5 recites:

9 "determining, upon selection of a cell in the word processing table, a type
10 of contents in the cell; and
11

12 interpreting user entry based upon the type of contents in the cell."

13 The Halberg reference discloses how *conditional formatting* may be
14 applied to cells within a spreadsheet. Conditional formatting involves changing a
15 format applied to data automatically, based on criteria established for the data.
16 For example, conditional formatting can be used to display data using red if the
17 value for the data is negative. (See generally, bottom of page 145.)
18

19 The Patent Office suggests that Halberg's conditional formatting discloses
20 the Applicant's claimed "interpreting user entry based upon the type of contents in
21 the cell." However, Halberg's formatting *relates to output* and/or display of the
22 information in the cell. The Applicant's "interpreting user entry" *relates to data*
23 input. Thus, Halberg is discussing how to format the output, while the Applicant's
24 claim recites how to interpret the input.
25

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

1 The Applicant's claim recites "interpreting user entry," and therefore
2 relates to input of data. More, particularly, the Applicant's claim recites
3 interpretation of the input (entry) based on the type of the contents of the cell. For
4 example, if the contents of the cell are text, interpreting the user input may
5 involve, in part, providing the user with a text-type cursor. (See the bottom
6 paragraph of the Applicant's page 26.)

7 In contrast, Halberg formats the output based on the value of the cell. (E.g.
8 format negative numbers in red colored font.) Halberg allows a conditional format
9 to be set, which if satisfied, triggers a type of data format. Therefore, Halberg
10 controls the output of a cell with conditional formatting.

11 Therefore, since Halberg discloses formatting or output technology, and the
12 Applicant's claim recites user entry or input technology, Halberg does not disclose
13 elements recited in the Applicant's claim. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully
14 requests that the Patent Office lift the rejection of claim 5.

15 Claim 6 recites, in part:

16 "if the type of contents is a formula or non-text data, interpreting the user
17 entry as applicable to spreadsheet functions; and
18

19 if the type of contents is not a formula or non-text data, interpreting the user
20 entry as applicable to word processing functions."
21

22 As seen in the discussion of claim 5, Halberg discloses conditional
23 formatting of a cell depending on the data contained within the cell. E.g. using
24 Halberg's technology, negative numbers could be formatted using red color. In
25

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

S/N 09/599,810

1 contrast, claim 6 recites interpreting user entry depending on the type of the
2 contents of the cell. For example, where a cell contains formula and non-text data,
3 user input is interpreted according to spreadsheet functions, while a cell having
4 text, for example, would be interpreted according to word processing functions.

5 Thus, claim 6 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 5, and the
6 arguments of claim 5 are incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, since
7 Halberg discloses formatting or output technology, and the Applicant's claim
8 recites user entry or input technology, Halberg does not disclose elements recited
9 in the Applicant's claim. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the
10 Patent Office lift the rejection of claim 6.

11 Claim 7 recites in part:

12 "evaluating whether the type of contents is a formula;

13 if the type of contents is a formula, highlighting all of the formula and
14 allowing editing in a formula edit box; and

15 if the type of contents is not a formula, placing a cursor in the cell."

16 Halberg discloses on the bottom of page 197 three ways that the Formula
17 Palette may be invoked. All three methods require the user to do something, such
18 as "click OK," "click the Paste Function," or "click the equals sign button." Thus,
19 Halberg requires user action. In contrast, the Applicant's claim recites,
20 "evaluating whether the type of contents is a formula" and then "if the type of
21 contents is a formula" performing a first function, and if not, performing a second
22 function. Thus, the Applicant recites evaluating the contents for type, and then,
23
24
25

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

1 based on the type, presenting the user with either of two situations. Therefore, the
2 recited claim discloses significant differences with respect to the cited reference.

3 The Patent Office suggests that the Formula Palette technology discloses
4 the elements recited. However, the Formula Palette is invoked by user action
5 (bottom of page 197). In contrast, the claim recites "evaluating whether the type
6 of contents is a formula" and then providing the user with either of two different
7 situations, based on the evaluation. Since Halberg fails to evaluate the contents of
8 a cell and provide an alternative to the user, Halberg fails to disclose the elements
9 recited in the Applicant's claim. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests
10 that the rejection of claim 7 be removed.
11

12 Claim 8 was amended to include the material of claim 9, and recites in part:

13 "resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula, while
14 maintaining the particular cell and table as a whole at a constant size."

15 The Halberg reference discloses "minimizing" the Formula Palette, which
16 temporarily removes it from view, such as when it is not being used, and is
17 therefore temporarily unneeded. However, claim 8 recites resizing the formula
18 edit box "*as the user enters the formula*" (emphasis added). As seen on page 28,
19 lines 10—18, of the Applicant's disclosure, this is beneficial since "If the formula
20 exceeds the initial size, the formula edit box is resized to accommodate the
21 formula," (page 28, lines 13—14). Thus, "*resizing the formula edit box as the*
22 *user enters the formula,*" helps to accommodate a formula that may get longer
23 than the initial box, as the user types it in. Halberg does not address this issue,
24
25

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

1 which is recited by the Applicant's claim (i.e. wherein the formula edit box is
2 resized during the time wherein the user is typing the formula), and therefore
3 Halberg fails to disclose the elements of the claim.

4 Therefore, claim 8 recites a functionality not disclosed by Halberg, which
5 addresses a problem not foreseen or addressed by Halberg. Accordingly, the
6 Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

7 Claims 10 and 12—13 depends from claim 1, and are allowable by virtue of
8 this dependence, as well as for reasons associated with the elements recited.

9 Claim 14 has been amended similarly to claim 8, and is allowable for
10 substantially the same reasons.

11 Claim 15 recites, in part:

12 "wherein the formula edit box initially defaults to a size and shape of the
13 particular cell in the table."

14 The Halberg reference discloses at FIG. 3.19 that the formula is entered in a
15 "formula bar" near the top of the window (see where it says "every formula must
16 begin with an equal sign"). Halberg also discloses at FIG. 6.19 that the Formula
17 Palette is a relatively large window that obscures more than one cell in the table.
18 The fact that the Formula Palette can be resized (as noted by the Patent Office) is
19 irrelevant with respect to the issue of its initial default size, which is what is
20 recited by the claim. In fact, Halberg does not disclose a "formula edit box that
21 initially defaults to the size and shape of the particular cell in the table."
22
23
24
25

S/N 09/599,810

1 Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 15 be
2 removed.

3 Claim 17 is dependent on claim 14, and is allowable based on that
4 dependency, as well as for reasons associated with the elements recited by claim
5 17.

6 Claim 18 recites in part:

7 "extending the formula edit box horizontally and subsequently enlarging
8 the formula edit box vertically as the user enters the formula."

9 The Halberg reference discloses at FIG. 3.19 a "command line" wherein the
10 formula may be entered after entering "=". Also, at FIG. 6.5 and other locations, a
11 Formula Palette is shown. However, neither of these shows any evidence of the
12 ability to extend horizontally, and then subsequently to extend vertically, to
13 increase the size of the formula edit box "*as the user enters the formula.*" This
14 sort of automatic resizing is simply not shown by Halberg. Accordingly, the
15 Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office remove the rejection to claim
16 18.
17

18 Claim 19, 20 and 22 depends from claim 14, and are allowable by virtue of
19 this dependency, as well as for reasons associated with the elements recited by
20 each claim.
21

22 Claim 21 recites "a free floating field," and is allowable for reasons similar
23 to those discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 1, which are incorporated
24 herein.
25

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

1 Claims 23—28 were rejected along the lines of claim 14. Accordingly, the
2 argument of claims 8 and 14 is incorporated at this location.

3 Claim 29 was rejected along the rationale of claims 10, 12 and 14.
4 Accordingly, the arguments used in support of these claims are incorporated at this
5 location.

6 Claim 30 was rejected along the rationale of claims 1 and 10. Accordingly,
7 the arguments used in support of these claims are incorporated at this location.

8 Claim 31 was rejected along the rationale of claim 23. Accordingly, the
9 arguments used in support of this claim, and claims 8 and 14, are incorporated at
10 this location.

11 Claim 32 was rejected along the rationale of claims 10, 14. Accordingly,
12 the arguments used in support of these claims are incorporated at this location.

13 Claim 33 was rejected along the rationale of claim 1. Accordingly, the
14 arguments used in support of this claim are incorporated at this location.

15 Claim 34 was rejected along the rationale of claims 10. Accordingly, the
16 arguments used in support of this claim are incorporated at this location.

17 Claim 35 was rejected along the rationale of claim 12. Accordingly, the
18 arguments used in support of this claim are incorporated at this location.

19 Claim 36 was rejected along the rationale of claim 18. Accordingly, the
20 arguments used in support of these claims are incorporated at this location.

21 Claim 37 was rejected along the rationale of claims 1 and 10. Accordingly,
22 the arguments used in support of these claims are incorporated at this location.
23
24
25

S/N 09/599,810

Response to Office Action Dated 12/22/2004

1 Claim 38 was rejected along the rationale of claims 50. Accordingly, the
2 arguments used in support of these claims are incorporated at this location.

3 Claim 50 was rejected along the rationale of claims 1 and 5. Accordingly,
4 the arguments used in support of these claims are incorporated at this location.

5 Claim 51 was rejected along the rationale of claims 23. Accordingly, the
6 arguments used in support of this claim are incorporated at this location.

7 Claim 64 was rejected along the rationale of claims 1 and 4. Accordingly,
8 the arguments used in support of these claims are incorporated at this location.

9 Conclusion

10 The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance
11 and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office's
12 next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the
13 Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the
14 purpose of scheduling an interview.

15 Respectfully Submitted,

16 Dated: 4-6-05

17 By: 

18 David S. Thompson
19 Reg. No. 37,954
20 Attorney for Applicant

21 LEE & HAYES PLLC
22 Suite 500
23 421 W. Riverside Avenue
24 Spokane, Washington 99201
25 Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979